

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Applicant notes that claims 20 and 22 have been amended and new claims 25-26 have been added. Thus, claims 2-8, 10-14 and 20-26 are pending in the application.

**Section 103 Rejections:**

In the Office Action, claims 2-8, 10-14 and 20-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li (US Patent No. 6,012,088) in view of Liebenow (US Patent No. 6,530,083).

With regard to independent claim 20, Applicant notes that this claim has been amended to recite generating control data at the remote server from the entered preference for configuration of the device according to the entered preference, and sending the control data from the remote server onto the device causing an initiation of the device configuration to enable processing and play out of multimedia content according to the entered preference.

In contrast, Li generally describes sending from a remote server to a customer's Internet access device a configuration record to automatically configure the access device for complicated network connections, such as ISDN, and network services, such as email. Applicant respectfully submits that the configuration record described in Li does not initiate device configuration to enable processing and play out of multimedia content according to the entered preference as recited in claim 20. In fact, the Office Action even acknowledges that Li does not teach these aspects of the claimed invention, and instead, the Office Action relies on Liebenow.

Liebenow, however, generally describes a convergence device that can adjust the settings of the device, such as volume level, base level, treble level, brightness and contrast, based on user profiles. Applicant respectfully submits that these user profiles are generated and stored locally at the convergence device using a user interface associated with the convergence device. The Advisory Action, however, refers to Col. 9, lines 41-45 of Liebenow for the proposition that Liebenow teaches a remote server that may be used to control multimedia devices, where instructions to configure the playback of multimedia information is stored on a server and retrieved over a network. Applicant points out that the cited passage refers to different ways in which the convergence device can obtain software to locally generate and store user profiles, namely the software can be pre-loaded on the convergence device or the convergence device can

download the software to the convergence device for local execution. In either event, the user profiles are locally generated and stored at the convergence device. Applicant, accordingly, respectfully submits that Liebenow fails to teach or suggest generating control data at the remote server from the entered preference for configuration of the device according to the entered preference, and sending the control data from the remote server onto the device causing an initiation of the device configuration to enable processing and play out of multimedia content according to the entered preference as recited in claim 20.

Even if Liebenow is combined with Li, Applicant respectfully submits that this combination, at most, teaches automatic configuration of network connections and network services using remotely generated configuration records and local generation and storage of user profiles of the convergence device using a user interface associated with the convergence device, where the software (instructions) for locally generating the user profiles can be downloaded from a remote computer using the automatically configured network connection. Embodiments of claim 20 alleviate many of the problems associated with Li and Liebenow by allowing configuration data to enable processing and play out of multimedia content according to the entered preferences to be generated at a remote server using more robust user interfaces than those available at the device. Therefore, because Li and Liebenow, alone and in combination, fail to teach or suggest claim 20, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103(a) rejection with respect to claim 20 and all claims dependent thereon be withdrawn.

With regard to independent claim 22, Applicant notes that this claim recites subject matter similar to claim 20. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103(a) rejection with respect to claim 22 and all claims dependent thereon be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 20.

Applicant has also added new claims 25-26, which Applicant believes further defines the claimed invention over the cited art of record. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that Li and Liebenow, alone and in combination, fail to teach or suggest control data for scheduling recording of multimedia content as recited in these claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-8, 10-14 and 20-26 are in condition for allowance. Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests that a notice of allowance be issued with respect to claims 2-8, 10-14 and 20-26.

Please charge any fees which may be required, except the issue fee, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Date: October 25, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By Kevin Simons

Kevin Simons, Reg. No. 45,110

(408) 474-9075

Philips Electronics North America

1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41

San Jose, CA 95131 USA

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 27 2003

OFFICIAL